

REMARKS

In response to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, action of the user of the client system has been added to the claims. It is believed, however, that action of the user of the second client system is irrelevant to the claimed invention. Thus, no such action is being claimed. Consequently, it is requested that the Examiner withdraw the §112 rejections.

Claims 1 - 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by GUDJONSSON in view of MANBER et al. Applicant respectfully traverses.

The independent claims now require one interface for two way messaging (e.g., Fig. 10) and another interface for chat (e.g., Fig. 8). When the switch between chat and two way messaging occurs, the interface switches.

In contrast, GUDJONN SON discloses a single interface the permits chat and two way messaging. Thus, switching between different interfaces cannot occur. MANBER et al. do not supply the deficiency.

Consequently, for at least these reasons it is requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 4, 7, 10, and 13.

Dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14-20 are also believed to recite further patentable subject matter of the invention and therefore are also believed allowable over the prior art. As such, allowance of the dependent claims is deemed proper for at least the same reasons noted for the independent claims, in addition to reasons related to their own recitations. For example, claims 16 – 20

require a button for switching, as well as interruption of the messaging.

GUDJONNISON only operates in response to invitations. Thus, no interruption is possible. Moreover, GUDJONNISON does not supply such a button.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and an indication of the allowability of all of the claims in the present application.

The amendments to the claims and new claims add no prohibited new matter. The amendments are supported, *inter alia*, by Figs. 8, 10, and 11 and pages 22, 23, and 27 of the specification.

The above amendments have been presented merely for the purpose of clarification, and not to overcome the applied prior art. Accordingly, no estoppel is deemed to result from any of the present amendments.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,
Kazutoyo MAEHIRO

Will E. Lydell Reg. No. 41,568
Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

November 1, 2004
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191